REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2008, claims 1 to 15, 17 to 21, and 23 to 27 are presented for examination, of which claims 1, 6, 10, 20, 23 and 26 are independent. Claims 16 and 22 are cancelled. Claims 26 and 27 have been newly added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections

Claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Burke (US 20040070594 A1). Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "detecting a real time event while monitoring a plurality of event signals wherein the plurality of event signals are generated by a plurality of engines and one of the plurality of engines is a 3D engine." Burke discloses a terminal comprised of an input interface, a buffer and a conventional display device (see [0062]). The terminal receives a stream of data through a modem where the stream of data incorporates a series of programme elements each of which constitutes one or more video images and associated audio data (see [0063]). The data stream also contains programme generation control and priority data (see [0061], [0065], and [0070]). The data stream is generated by a TV camera and classified by the system operator as it is captured (see [0070]). The data stream is then transmitted through a telephone line to the remote terminal (see [0071]). The terminal then selects programme elements, based upon the associated control and priority classification data, resulting in the presentation of an assembled programme. Applicants interpretation of the basis for rejection is that the programme elements and associated control data are seen to constitute a stream of event signals that are being monitored and detected by the terminal. In the current invention, the amended claims limit the event signals to those generated by a plurality of engines wherein one of the plurality of engines is a 3D engine. For example, the 3D engine is a hardware device such as may be found in the ATI Radeon graphics accelerator. In contrast, the event signals in Burke are generated by a system operator who allocates classification data to the video and audio content where the classifications are a subjective indication of the content of the video and audio content (see [0070]). Therefore, the new limitation to claim 1 distinguishes the present invention from Burke.

10

Independent claims 6, 10, 20, 23 and 26 generally correspond to the apparatus of method claim 1 in that they have been amended to include the limitation "wherein the plurality of event signals are generated by a plurality of engines and one of the plurality of engines is a 3D engine."

As such, independent claims 1, 6, 10, 20, 23 and 26 are believed to be in condition for allowance. The remaining claims in the application are each dependent from one of the aforementioned independent claims and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 22, 2009   By: _____

Matthew Evans, Reg. No. 56,530
858-651-7571

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

11